1 1991); Mannhalt v. Reed, 847 F.2d 576, 579 (9th Cir. 1988); Kealohapauole v. Shimoda, 800
2 F.2d 1463, 1464-65 (9th Cir. 1986). Thus, to present a cognizable federal habeas corpus claim
3 under § 2254, a state prisoner must allege both that he is in custody pursuant to a "judgment of
4 a State court," and that he is in custody in "violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the
5 United States." See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). Petitioner's failure to identify any grounds for relief
6 in the Petition and failure to identify which, if any, conviction he is challenging, fails to satisfy
7 these pleading requirements.
8 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases provides for summary dismissal of a

Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases provides for summary dismissal of a habeas petition "[i]f it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any attached exhibits that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court . . ." Rule 4, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. Here, it appears plain from the Petition that Petitioner is not presently entitled to federal habeas relief because he has not satisfied the filing fee requirement and has not provided any grounds for relief.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

For all the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. If Petitioner wishes to proceed with this case, he must submit, **no later than May 24, 2010**, a copy of this Order with the \$5.00 fee or with adequate proof of his inability to pay the fee **and** file a First Amended Petition which cures the pleading defects identified above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 24, 2010

HON. DANA M. SABRAW United States District Judge

CC:ALL PARTIES